

Date: Wed, 30 Mar 94 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #154
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 30 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 154

Today's Topics:

Coord. priority for open repeaters
Dan Pickersgill Fan Club
Incentive Licensing (2 msgs)
Ramsey Kits
Space Station License

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 28 Mar 1994 22:17:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Coord. priority for open repeaters
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>

>>>So if I monitored the INPUTS of closed repeaters, measured their PLs with a
>>>counter, then proceeded to work through those machines, I'm legal as long as
>>>I don't cause interference?

>>

>>No, you would be in violation of Part 97.

>

>What rule in particular? Remember that all *I* am doing in these cases is
>transmitting a signal.

In particular Part 97.101 (a), (b) and maybe (d). And the FCC has confirmed this opinion in the last 2 months. See the Westlink Report dated 28 February 1994 for details.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 30 Mar 94 04:54:11 GMT

From: agate!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!swrinde!news.uh.edu!
uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

Subject: Dan Pickersgill Fan Club

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Join now, before it's too late!

--

"Meeting him, shaking his hand--it was overwhelming. It was better than sex. Of course, I haven't had sex before, but I'm sure this was better."

--A Codeless Technician, after meeting Dan Pickersgill for the first time.

Date: 30 Mar 94 02:00:33 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!kennish@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

Subject: Incentive Licensing

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, I've *tried* to stay out, but now, my 2 cents worth.....

I haven't seen anyone bring this point out recently, but if some have, my apologies in advance.

In this country, the incentive seems to be bits and pieces of the HF spectrum....

Well, I propose that we divvy up what I consider to be the choice spectrum of the future, UHF and beyond. Note now that we are giving away the entire amateur band above 50 MHz to the no-clues... I say no clues not because of code, but because many don't have the knowledge to "advance the

art" as stated in Part 97.1(c).

Before I get singed from flames, I'm not saying that we have to make *all* the tests harder, but that there should be some spectrum reserved for those who demonstrate that they have the knowledge to "advance the art of radio".

Face it, the level of questions, even at the 4A level are nothing like those that the FCC has given in the past, especially for the 1st class Commercial Phone exam.

It's time to re-align the licensing structure. For HF, if the metric for proficiency is code, let it be -- there are historic reasons for that, and we can all die before it is settled. But for VHF and beyond, we need a new metric for proficiency. Let those that want to experiment with ham radio and play at the level of today's no-code tech have their segment of the band with what appears to them as magical black boxes (repeaters). Those that want to really experiment and can demonstrate their knowledge on a REAL exam should be granted access to another sliver of spectrum where new methods of radio communication can be toyed with.

Of course, we don't want to end up with 2 zillion license classes, so.... Let's roll novice and tech together. Really, passing 3A after 2 isn't THAT hard is it? 1A would get you a HF endorsement, just like now. General and Advanced could be rolled into one also. Look at the licensing stats, hardly anyone goes for general. It seems that anyone who is willing to spend the effort to get 1B can study and get 4A instead of 3B. Extra would be split into two. Those that want those "choice" slivers of HF would have to pass 1C, those that don't would be fine with 1B. But the Extra written exam should be hard, and require demonstration of knowledge commensurate with someone who is capable of technically advancing the art, preferably without multiple guess questions -- sure grading it would be harder than the VE sitting there comparing letters, but the number of people going for this exam should be small, and a true VE should welcome the opportunity to bring someone knowledgeable to advancing the art to ham radio. Passing that exam would get you the so called experimenter's bands in VHF and above.

I solicit comments, and constructive criticism to be posted. Flames to /dev/null. Please, no e-mail on this one since it's too hard to carry a discussion with N people individually.

Ken

Date: Tue, 29 Mar 1994 08:26:14 +0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!
news.tamu.edu!idmb-secretary.tamu.edu!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have a question. I've read many comments over the past several months about "incentive licensing" and how it has affected amateur radio. I gather that this was a concept that was introduced in the 60's or 70's. What I'd like to know, is what IS incentive licensing, and how it was different from the previous method, and how it's different from what we have now.

Thanks

Troyce
KC5CBI
(Tech Plus as of Saturday, and working towards General)

--

Please read THE ELEMENT OF FIRE by Martha Wells, a Tor hardback at quality bookstores near you. I live with the author and want to go back to Disney World this year :)

Date: Mon, 28 Mar 1994 20:38:11 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!
csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!bertino@ames.arpa
Subject: Ramsey Kits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have a question. Is it legal to broadcast with a FM Ramsey kit. In the manual it says that it is. Is this true?

I would like to play Halloween music during Halloween and Christmas music during Christmas (of course) for the cars driving down my court.

Any info would be great.

Thanks

bertino@netcom.com

--

_ _	_ _		Don Bertino
\ \	_ _	/ /	bertino@netcom.com
\ \	_ _	/ /	"My castle is almost done."
\ \	_ _	/ /	I am a BIG Halloween and
\ \	_ _	/ /	Christmas outdoor decorating
\ \	_ _	/ /	nut. Let me know if you are
\ \	_ _	/ /	one too!! New group???

Date: 29 Mar 94 20:54:13 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cc.usu.edu!sly46@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Space Station License
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi all, got a question.

Date: Mon, 28 Mar 94 03:25:52 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>, <mp3fntINNk13@news.bbn.com>,
<5i5Np6h.edellers@delphi.com>x
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <5i5Np6h.edellers@delphi.com>,
Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:
>Joel B Levin <levin@bbn.com> writes:
>
>>The owners/operators/trustees of the closed repeater can deny you the
>>use of their repeater by closing it down. This they do at the cost of
>>denying its service to other users, and it's a tradeoff as to whether
>>it's worth doing that to keep the unwanted user off.
>>
>>On the other hand, that's about all they can do, and here's why. No
>
>So if I monitored the INPUTS of closed repeaters, measured their PLs with a
>counter, then proceeded to work through those machines, I'm legal as long as
>I don't cause interference? What if I monitored inputs of autopatch-equipped
>machines, decoded the DTMF codes being used and then proceeded to use the
>patch without permission?

You are changing the subject, you may be free to use the frequency but
not anyone elses repeater. You _may_ have a right to operate simplex on

the repeater input but that does not give you a right to use the repeater.

If a ham lives in a place where all the simplex frequencies are in use then he might be able to justify operating simplex on a unused frequency that happens to be a repeater input or output, otherwise it is bad operating practice.

If all of the simplex frequencies are always filled then it is possible that the frequency coordinators have an obligation to remove a repeater to provide more simplex frequencies.

--

Rod Anderson	"I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu	is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
I am not a crook	fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Whitewater Willie	Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Mon, 28 Mar 1994 22:09:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2n0e8l\$sd@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,

<1994Mar27.032737.3961@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <2n7630\$60d@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>

Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>In article <1994Mar27.032737.3961@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,

>Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu> wrote:

>>In article <2n0e8l\$sd@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,

>>sohl,william h <whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com> wrote:

>>> As to

>>>using another's amateur station, that's really a myth. If you place

>>>NO locks on the door, then anyone can incidently cause the repeater to

>>>operate which is exactly what the repeater was put on the air for.

>>

>>Sorry. You're saying that I can walk into an unlocked store and take anything

>>off the shelves I want without paying for it.

>

>Physical appropriation (i.e. theft) is not at all the example. If

>Radio Shack has a demo set up to which anyone can dial in via a modem

>and trial something, then they can not invoke a "we don't want you

>to use this because you're not wanted here."

Tell that to compuserve, america online, delphi, et al.

>>It's exactly the point: You can't walk into my shack and use my radio without
>>my permission. Why should my station on a tower be any different?

>

>Because no one is "trespassing" and you've left the access open via
>anyone's RF signal causing your repeater to operate.

Not according to the FCC. (Whom has jurisdiction by the way.)

>Here's another example... you install a motion detector to operate a set
>of driveway lights. The area of motion detection includes property that
>you do not own. Some kids in the neighborhood keep the light on by
>activating it via their movement in the area that isn't your property.
>What, if any, power do you think you have to force them not to do that?

Which has nothing to do with Amateur Radio. Now put that light in a public
park, what right has the city to limit access to certain times of the day,
say after 9pm. The answer is, that is the rules. You can argue all you
want, it is STILL and always has been, BAD amateur practice to do the
suggested.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: (null)

From: (null)

Now the question: Is there somewhere on-line I can get this
reference? If not, where can I get a hard-copy of this confusing
dribble of a reference?

Thanx in advance,
Markus
sly46@cc.usu.edu

Date: Mon, 28 Mar 1994 22:49:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <mp3fntINNk13@news.bbn.com>,

<1994Mar25.045650.1416@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <2n0e8l\$sd@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

[snip]

>By logical extension then, the FCC is saying that a specific frequency
>within the amateur band is now the sole possession of the repeater
>trustee to determine who can and can't use it. I really don't think
>that'll stand in the long run and as Jay mentions it sure hasn't been
>tested yet. Remember, you must be in violation of specific rules
>for the FCC to take action, fine you, etc.

Specifically, Part 97.101 (a) (b) and perhaps (d). How many rules do you
need to break before it is OK for the FCC to take action (hint: ONE).

>>The simple fact of the matter is that nobody has the right to use another's
>>amateur station without his permission. Arguments about freedom to use a
>>frequency are irrelevant: it's the use of the station that the FCC has said
>>is important.
>>Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can

Agreed Jay. And that is as it always has been, and IMHO, as it should be.

>The flaw in this last statement is that by virtue of establishing
>a repeater, one does offer the use of that repeater to all amateurs.

NO! One does NOT offer it to all amateurs. Never has meant that.

>Frankly, the existence of the repeater is publicly known, there is
>no established (by part 97 rules) practices that the repeater
>owner can point to that provides a means to set forth a list of
>who can (or more importantly who can't) use the repeater.

Try Part 97.101 thru Part 97.121 inclusive.

>As to
>using another's amateur station, that's really a myth.

Then WHO's station is it. It has to be someones. (That nasty old Part 97
again!)

>If you place
>NO locks on the door, then anyone can incidently cause the repeater to
>operate which is exactly what the repeater was put on the air for.

No, that is NOT what the repeater was put on the air for. And you just
gave away the argument. You admit that the repeater is to be used for

what it "was put on the air for" and NOT for any amateur that cares to use it despite the desires of the license holder.

>As to using the station, when I transmit, I'm only using my equipment.
>The "use" of the repeater is because the repeater is there. Maybe that
>sounds simplistic, but I'd bet a court would view it that way too.

I'll bet with the FCC. If you transmit on the input without consent of the repeater licensee, you are in violation of Part 97.101 (d).

>Frankly, repeater owners that want to forbid another from using
>the repeater just by asserting the demand to not use it is like telling
>people they shouldn't listen to your radio which you have playing
>in a public location, or if you had a PA system on, trying to tell
>people who have every right to be in the vicinity of the PA system to
>not speak into the microphone.

Exactly, you have no right to use a PA system without consent of the owner. Just as you have no right to phone service or cable TV. Theft of service is a crime. Just as stealing anything 'tangible'.

>Anyway, until a "test" case is pushed by some repeater owner, all
>this is conjecture and academic discussion. Frankly, I believe
>closed repeaters are wholly against the spirit and intent of amateur
>radio in general. Your mileage may vary...

There is no such thing as a closed repeater or open repeater. All repeater trustees have the right to limit, HOW THEY SEE FIT, the use of their equipment (and hence their license). Some, like the five I am a trustee for, are free to be used by any amateur that obeys Part 97 and simple courtesy(sp). Others are more restrictive. It is a matter of flavor.

I could well argue that Morse Code is so well entrenched in the "Spirit of Amateur Radio" that it should never be changed. (I won't though). Restricting use of repeaters IS the spirit of amateur radio, always has been. So, since you respect the spirit of the service, where's the bitch?

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 30 Mar 94 04:39:43 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!

usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar18.211656.18218@cs.brown.edu>,
<CMzFxB.9n1@freenet.carleton.ca>, <CnCE9y.BAz@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

Jeffrey Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> writes:

>If you believe learning code is a waste of time, then you probably see
>no worth in learning to play a musical instrument or teaching oneself
>art or studying a foreign language, none of which might help you get
>get a job.

None of those would be likely to help me get a job, but they MIGHT benefit me in some way, or they might not. In my case, the ONLY benefit to learning Morse Code would be to pass the 13 wpm test, and that is only "beneficial" because the FCC requires the 13 wpm test for the General and Advanced Class licenses. Once past that, the knowledge of Morse Code would give me NO further benefit, as I have no intention of ever using CW.

>Pushing buttons on a computer doesn't prepare one to do very much, unless
>your life ambition is to push buttons; seems rather boring to me.

But it pays the bills, and apparently enables him (as it does me) to live in a reasonable fashion and pursue other things.

Date: Sun, 27 Mar 1994 21:27:34 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Mar14112752@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<1994Mar18.211656.18218@cs.brown.edu>, <CMzFxB.9n1@freenet.carleton.ca>
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

>In a previous article, rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) says:
>
>>I'm sure glad I spent time in my youth learning computers and playing
>>a bit with electronics, rather than increasing my CW speed; I think I
>>might be having some trouble finding a job now otherwise...

Too bad you didn't. Learning CW teaches one a very valuable lesson of setting a long term goal that can only be reached by diligent day-to-day practice. It teaches one not to get discouraged if they don't see an immediate positive result due their study, for days if not weeks might pass by while stuck at a plateau; one learns not to expect quick

gratification but rather a gradual reward while code speed increases.

While learning the code I was also busy learning electronics so I could build my own station from scratch. The patience I was taught in building my code speed gave me the ability to spend hours trouble shooting newly built radios that wouldn't work (but produced plenty of smoke).

I can safely extend the above to this: I truly believe that the patience that was required to go from freshman level to research level mathematics was derived, in part, from learning code and building radios.

If you believe learning code is a waste of time, then you probably see no worth in learning to play a musical instrument or teaching oneself art or studying a foreign language, none of which might help you get a job.

Pushing buttons on a computer doesn't prepare one to do very much, unless your life ambition is to push buttons; seems rather boring to me.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 30 Mar 94 05:01:57 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!
library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem63.ucdavis.edu!ddtodd@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22MAR199406565240@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<032894004025Rnf0.77b8@amcomp.com>, <28MAR199417340477@rosie.uh.edu>
Subject : Re: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

In article <28MAR199417340477@rosie.uh.edu> st3qi@rosie.uh.edu (Killebrew, Brad A.) writes:

>In article <032894004025Rnf0.77b8@amcomp.com>, dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes..

>>Not the FCC. The HAMS! The FCC wants to drop the code tests (IMHO).>>

>>Dan N8PKV

>>

>I beg to differ. Read the back of a current Form 610.

Wow, you mean Form 610 has Dan's opinion printed on the back :-)

Dan (not that one) Todd

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #154
